

REFINED BOUND FOR SUM-FREE SETS IN GROUPS OF PRIME ORDER

JEAN-MARC DESHOUILERS AND VSEVOLOD F. LEV

ABSTRACT. Improving upon earlier results of Freiman and the present authors, we show that if p is a sufficiently large prime and A is a sum-free subset of the group of order p , such that $n := |A| > 0.318p$, then A is contained in a dilation of the interval $[n, p - n] \pmod{p}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The subset A of an additively written semigroup is called *sum-free* if there do not exist $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in A$ with $a_1 + a_2 = a_3$; equivalently, if A is disjoint with its *sumset* $A + A := \{a_1 + a_2 : a_1, a_2 \in A\}$. Introduced by Schur in 1916 (“the set of positive integers cannot be partitioned into finitely many sum-free subsets”), sum-free sets become now a classical object of study in additive combinatorics; we refer the reader to [DF06, L06b] and the papers, cited there, for the history and overview of the subject area.

Let G be a finite abelian group. It is easy to see that a randomly chosen “small” subset of G is sum-free with high probability, while a randomly chosen “large” subset of G with high probability is *not* sum-free. Thus, small sum-free subsets of G can be unstructured, whereas large sum-free subsets possess a rigid structure. Unraveling this structure for various underlying groups G is a fascinating problem which received much attention during the last decade.

In the present paper we consider groups of prime order p , which we identify with the quotient group $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. Let φ_p denote the canonical homomorphism from $\mathbb{Z}$ onto $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, and for a set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ let $\mathcal{S}_p$ denote the image of $\mathcal{S}$ under φ_p ; here the letter $\mathcal{S}$ will often be substituted by the interval notation so that, for instance, $[3, 6)_{11} = \{-8, 4, 16\}_{11}$ etc. The well-known Cauchy-Davenport inequality implies readily that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is sum-free, then $|A| \leq \lfloor (p+1)/3 \rfloor$. This estimate is sharp, as for $u = \lfloor (p+1)/3 \rfloor$ the set $[u, 2u-1]_p$, and consequently its dilates, are sum-free.

The main results of both [L06b] and [DF06] show that in fact for prime p , any large sum-free subset of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is close to a dilate of $(p/3, 2p/3)_p$. Specifically, it is proved in [L06b] for $\alpha_0 = 0.33$, and in [DF06] for $\alpha_0 = 0.324$ and p large enough that if A is a

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11P70 (primary), 11B75, 11T30 (secondary).

Key words and phrases. sum-free sets.

sum-free subset of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ with $n := |A| > \alpha_0 p$, then A is contained in a dilate of $[n, p-n]_p$. (As shown in [L06b], the interval $[n, p-n]_p$ is best possible in this context.)

For an integer d and a subset A of an abelian group let $d * A := \{da : a \in A\}$. The goal of the present paper is to prove

Theorem 1. *Let p be sufficiently large a prime and suppose that $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is sum-free. If $n := |A| > 0.318p$, then there exists $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $A \subseteq d * [n, p-n]_p$.*

The seemingly modest improvement of the constant from 0.324 to 0.318 requires a substantial effort and a number of new ideas, some at the level of Fourier analysis and others of a combinatorial nature; we believe that these ideas may actually be of more general interest than the improvement of the constant itself.

An example, presented in [L], shows that the constant in question cannot be reduced to below 0.2. Though the value 0.318 is not the precise limit of our method, narrowing significantly the gap between 0.2 and 0.318 seems to be a rather non-trivial and exciting problem.

2. SOME LEMMAS

We gather here several auxiliary results, used in the next section to prove Theorem 1.

It is well-known that if a set is sum-free, then its characteristic function has a large Fourier coefficient. Specifically, let e_p denote the character of the group $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, defined by $e_p(1) := \exp(2\pi i/p)$, and given a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ and an integer z write $\hat{A}(z) := \sum_{a \in A} e_p(az)$. A standard argument shows that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is sum-free with $|A| > \alpha_0 p$, then there exists $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\varphi_p(z) \neq 0$ such that $|\hat{A}(z)| > \frac{\alpha_0^2}{1-\alpha_0} p$. For $\alpha_0 = 0.318$ this leads to $|\hat{A}(z)| > 0.148p$, while the following lemma allows us to get $|\hat{A}(z)| > 0.152p$.

Lemma 1. *Let $\varkappa > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ be real numbers, and write $K := \lfloor \gamma^{-1/\varkappa} \rfloor$. Suppose that $P > K$ is an integer and $v_1, \dots, v_P$ are non-negative real numbers, satisfying*

$$\sum_{i=1}^P v_i = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^P v_i^{1+\varkappa} \geq \gamma.$$

Then the equation $Kx^{1+\varkappa} + (1-Kx)^{1+\varkappa} = \gamma$ in the variable x has exactly one solution in the interval $(1/(K+1), 1/K]$, and denoting this solution by X we have

$$\max\{v_1, \dots, v_P\} \geq X.$$

Proof. The existence and uniqueness of a solution is an immediate consequence of the intermediate value property: just notice that the function $f(x) := Kx^{1+\varkappa} + (1-Kx)^{1+\varkappa}$ is continuous and increasing on $[1/(K+1), 1/K]$, and that

$$f(1/(K+1)) = \frac{1}{(K+1)^\varkappa} < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{K^\varkappa} = f(1/K).$$

We now prove the second assertion. Let W denote the set of all those real vectors $(w_1, \dots, w_P) \in \mathbb{R}^P$ with non-negative coordinates, satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^P w_i = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^P w_i^{1+\varkappa} \geq \gamma$$

(so that $(v_1, \dots, v_P) \in W$). Observing that W is compact and $\max\{w_1, \dots, w_P\}$ is a continuous function on W , set

$$\mu := \min\{\max\{w_1, \dots, w_P\} : (w_1, \dots, w_P) \in W\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{C} := \{(w_1, \dots, w_P) \in W : \max\{w_1, \dots, w_P\} = \mu\}.$$

We notice that if $(w_1, \dots, w_P) \in \mathcal{C}$, then

$$\gamma \leq \sum_{i=1}^P w_i^{1+\varkappa} \leq \mu^\varkappa \sum_{i=1}^P w_i = \mu^\varkappa,$$

whence

$$\frac{1}{\mu} \leq \gamma^{-1/\varkappa} < K + 1. \quad (1)$$

On the other hand, it is readily verified that if $w_i = 1/K$ for $i \in [1, K]$ and $w_i = 0$ for $i \in [K+1, P]$, then $(w_1, \dots, w_P) \in W$, and hence $\mu \leq 1/K$, implying $1/\mu \geq K$. Comparing this with (1) we derive that

$$\lfloor 1/\mu \rfloor = K. \quad (2)$$

For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $i, j \in [1, P]$ with $i \neq j$, define the operator $T_{ij}^{(\delta)} : \mathbb{R}^P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^P$ by $T_{ij}^{(\delta)}(w_1, \dots, w_P) = (w'_1, \dots, w'_P)$, where $w'_i = w_i + \delta$, $w'_j := w_j - \delta$, and $w'_k = w_k$ for $k \in [1, P] \setminus \{i, j\}$. Observe that if $w_i < w_j$ and $0 < \delta < (w_j - w_i)/2$, then $\sum_{i=1}^P (w'_i)^{1+\varkappa} < \sum_{i=1}^P w_i^{1+\varkappa}$.

Note, that if $(w_1, \dots, w_P) \in \mathcal{C}$, then not all coordinates w_i are equal to each other: else they all would be equal to $1/P$, implying $\gamma \leq P \cdot (1/P)^{1+\varkappa} = P^{-\varkappa}$ and hence contradicting $P \geq K + 1 > \gamma^{-1/\varkappa}$.

We claim now that if $(w_1, \dots, w_P) \in \mathcal{C}$, then equality holds in $\sum_{i=1}^P w_i^{1+\varkappa} \geq \gamma$. Indeed, assuming that $\sum_{i=1}^P w_i^{1+\varkappa} > \gamma$, find $i, j \in [1, P]$ with $w_i < w_j = \mu$ and apply to $(w_1, \dots, w_P)$ the transformation $T_{ij}^{(\delta)}$ with $\delta \in (0, (w_j - w_i)/2)$ small enough to ensure that the resulting vector $(w'_1, \dots, w'_P)$ satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^P (w'_i)^{1+\varkappa} > \gamma$. Repeating this procedure sufficiently many times, we find eventually a vector $(u_1, \dots, u_P) \in W$ with $\max\{u_1, \dots, u_P\} < \mu$, contradicting the definition of μ .

Next, we observe that for any $(w_1, \dots, w_P) \in \mathcal{C}$ there is at most one index $i \in [1, P]$ such that $0 < w_i < \mu$. For if $0 < w_i \leq w_j < \mu$, where $i, j \in [1, P]$ are distinct, then, applying to $(w_1, \dots, w_P)$ the transformation $T_{ij}^{(\delta)}$ with δ negative and sufficiently small

in absolute value, we obtain a vector $(w'_1, \dots, w'_P) \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^P (w'_i)^{1+\varkappa} > \gamma$; however, we showed above that this is impossible.

Fix $(w_1, \dots, w_P) \in \mathcal{C}$. As it follows from our last observation, there is an integer $k \in [1, P-1]$ such that, re-ordering the coordinates of $(w_1, \dots, w_P)$, if necessary, we can write

$$\mu = w_1 = \dots = w_k > w_{k+1} \geq 0 = w_{k+2} = \dots = w_P.$$

From

$$k\mu \leq \sum_{i=1}^P w_i < (k+1)\mu$$

it follows then that $k \leq 1/\mu < k+1$, whence $k = \lfloor 1/\mu \rfloor = K$ by (2), and consequently $w_{k+1} = 1 - K\mu$. This yields

$$K\mu^{1+\varkappa} + (1 - K\mu)^{1+\varkappa} = \gamma,$$

so that in fact $\mu = X$, implying the second assertion of the lemma and indeed, showing that the estimate of the lemma is sharp. $\square$

As indicated at the beginning of this section, Lemma 1 will be used to show that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is sum-free with $|A| > 0.318p$, then there exists $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\varphi_p(z) \neq 0$ and such that $|\widehat{A}(z)| > 0.152p$. A well-known result of Freiman leads then to the conclusion that there is an interval of the form $[u, u + p/2)_p$, with an integer u , containing at least $(|A| + |\widehat{A}(z)|)/2 > 0.235p$ elements of the dilation $z * A$. Our next lemma, which is a reformulation of [L06a, Corollary 2], allows us to improve this to $0.238p$.

Lemma 2 ([L06a, Corollary 2]). *Let p be a positive integer and suppose that $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. If $n = |A|$ and $S = \sum_{a \in A} e_p(a)$, then there exists an integer u such that*

$$|A \cap [u, u + p/2)_p| \geq \frac{n}{2} + \frac{p}{2\pi} \arcsin \left(|S| \sin \frac{\pi}{p} \right).$$

For a subset A of an additively written abelian group write

$$A - A := \{a_1 - a_2 : a_1, a_2 \in A\}.$$

The following lemma follows readily from the results of [F62]; see also [LS95, Theorem 2].

Lemma 3. *Let ℓ and m be positive integers and suppose that $A \subseteq [0, \ell]$ is a set of integers such that $|A| = m$, $0 \in A$, $\ell \in A$, and $\gcd(A) = 1$. Then*

$$|A - A| \geq \min\{\ell + m, 3m - 3\}.$$

The next two lemmas deal with the structure of the difference set $A - A$ in the case where A is a dense set of integers.

Lemma 4 ([L06b, Lemma 2]). *Let m and ℓ be positive integers, satisfying $\ell \leq 2m - 2$, and suppose that $A \subseteq [0, \ell]$ is a set of integers such that $|A| = m$. Then for any integer $k \geq 1$ we have*

$$\left(\frac{\ell - m + 1}{k}, \frac{m}{k} \right) \subseteq A - A.$$

Lemma 5 ([L06b, Lemma 3]). *Let m and ℓ be positive integers and suppose that $A \subseteq [0, \ell]$ is a set of integers such that $|A| = m$. If $\ell < \frac{2k-1}{k}m - 1$ with an integer $k \geq 2$, then*

$$\left(-\frac{m}{k-1}, \frac{m}{k-1} \right) \subseteq A - A.$$

We notice that Lemmas 4 and 5 remain valid if A is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ (instead of $\mathbb{Z}$), the condition $A \subseteq [0, \ell]$ is replaced by $A \subseteq [u, u + \ell]_p$ with integers u and $\ell < p$, and the intervals in the conclusions of the lemmas are replaced by their images under φ_p . Similarly, the estimate of Lemma 3 remains valid if $A \subseteq [u, u + \ell]_p$ with integer u and $\ell < p/2$, and given that the set $\varphi_p^{-1}(A) \cap [u, u + \ell]$ is not contained in an arithmetic progression of length, smaller than ℓ .

The next lemma is a restatement of a particular case of a $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ -version of [DF06, Lemma 3].

Lemma 6. *Let p be a prime and let $1 \leq \ell < p$ and u be integers. Suppose that $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is sum-free and that $A_0 \subseteq [u, u + \ell]_p \cap A$, and write $m := |A_0|$. If $\ell \leq 2m - 2$, then for any integer $a \in [\ell/4, \ell/2]$ with $\varphi_p(a) \in A$ we have*

$$[2a - (2m - \ell - 2), 2a + (2m - \ell - 2)]_p \cap (A \cup (-A)) = \emptyset.$$

For the convenience of the reader we provide a proof.

Proof of Lemma 6. Since $|\{z, z + a\}_p \cap A| \leq 1$ for any integer z , the set A_0 has at most a elements in each of the intervals $[u, u + 2a - 1]_p$ and $[u + (\ell - 2a + 1), u + \ell]_p$, and consequently we have

$$|A_0 \cap [u + 2a, u + \ell]_p| \geq m - a \quad \text{and} \quad |A_0 \cap [u, u + (\ell - 2a)]_p| \geq m - a. \quad (3)$$

Assuming now that there exists an integer $x \in [2a - (2m - \ell - 2), 2a + (2m - \ell - 2)]$ with $\varphi_p(x) \in A \cup (-A)$, we will obtain a contradiction.

Suppose first that $x > 2a$ and consider in this case the two-element sets

$$\{u, u + x\}_p, \{u + 1, u + 1 + x\}_p, \dots, \{u + \ell - x, u + \ell\}_p.$$

(We notice that (3), along with $a \leq \ell/2 < m$, implies that $m - a \leq \ell - 2a + 1$, whence $\ell \geq a + m - 1$ and consequently, $\ell - x \geq \ell - (2a + (2m - \ell - 2)) = 2(\ell - a - m + 1) \geq 0$.) These sets are pairwise disjoint (as $u + \ell - x < u + x$ in view of $2x > 4a \geq \ell$) and they

all are contained in $[u, u + \ell - 2a]_p \cup [u + 2a, u + \ell]_p$. Since at most one element out of each of these $\ell - x + 1$ sets belongs to A_0 , we conclude that

$$|[u, u + \ell - 2a]_p \setminus A_0| + |[u + 2a, u + \ell]_p \setminus A_0| \geq \ell - x + 1.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |[u, u + \ell - 2a]_p \cap A_0| + |[u + 2a, u + \ell]_p \cap A_0| &\leq 2(\ell - 2a + 1) - (\ell - x + 1) \\ &\leq \ell - 4a + (2a + (2m - \ell - 2)) + 1 \\ &= 2(m - a) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting (3).

Similarly, if $x < 2a$, then we obtain a contradiction with (3) considering the $\ell - 4a + x + 1$ sets

$$\begin{aligned} \{u + 2a - x, u + 2a\}_p, \{u + 2a - x + 1, u + 2a + 1\}_p, \\ \dots, \{u + \ell - 2a, u + \ell - 2a + x\}_p \end{aligned}$$

which, again, are pairwise disjoint and contained in $[u, u + \ell - 2a]_p \cup [u + 2a, u + \ell]_p$. $\square$

Lemma 7. *Let p be a prime and suppose that $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is sum-free. Write $n := |A|$. If*

$$[-(p - n + 1)/3, (p - n + 1)/3]_p \cap A = \emptyset,$$

then $A \subseteq [n, p - n]_p$.

Proof. Set

$$\mu := \min\{|z| : z \in \mathbb{Z}, \varphi_p(z) \in A\}, \quad (4)$$

so that $\mu > (p - n + 1)/3$. Clearly, for any $a \in [\mu, 2\mu)_p \cap A$ we have $a + \mu \in [2\mu, 3\mu)_p \setminus A$, which gives

$$|[\mu, 3\mu)_p \cap A| \leq \mu.$$

Assuming that $\mu < p/4$ we get then

$$n \leq \mu + |[3\mu, p - \mu]_p| \leq \mu + (p - 4\mu + 1) = p - 3\mu + 1$$

whence $3\mu \leq p - n + 1$, contradicting the assumptions. We have therefore $\mu > p/4$ and then $3\mu > p - \mu$, implying

$$n = |A \cap [\mu, 3\mu)_p| \leq \mu;$$

that is, $[0, n - 1]_p \cap A = \emptyset$. In a similar way (or applying the argument above to the set $-A := \{-a : a \in A\}$) we obtain $[p - (n - 1), p]_p \cap A = \emptyset$. The result follows. $\square$

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Suppose that p is a prime and $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is a sum-free set with $n := |A| > 0.318p$. The computations below tacitly assume that p is sufficiently large.

Recalling the definition of $\widehat{A}(z)$ from the beginning of Section 2, we start with

Claim 1. *There exists an integer z_0 with $\varphi_p(z_0) \neq 0$ such that $|\widehat{A}(z_0)| > 0.152p$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha := n/p$, so that $\alpha > 0.318$. By the Parseval identity we have

$$\sum_{z=1}^{p-1} |\widehat{A}(z)|^2 = \alpha(1-\alpha)p^2. \quad (5)$$

Using the fact that $|\widehat{A}(p-z)| = |\widehat{A}(z)|$ for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ and letting $P := (p-1)/2$ we re-write (5) as

$$\sum_{z=1}^P \frac{|\widehat{A}(z)|^2}{\alpha(1-\alpha)p^2/2} = 1.$$

On the other hand, since A is sum-free we have

$$\sum_{z=0}^{p-1} |\widehat{A}(z)|^2 \widehat{A}(z) = 0,$$

whence

$$\sum_{z=1}^{p-1} |\widehat{A}(z)|^3 \geq - \sum_{z=1}^{p-1} |\widehat{A}(z)|^2 \widehat{A}(z) = |\widehat{A}(0)|^3 = \alpha^3 p^3$$

and consequently

$$\sum_{z=1}^P \left(\frac{|\widehat{A}(z)|^2}{\alpha(1-\alpha)p^2/2} \right)^{3/2} \geq \sqrt{2} \left(\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \right)^{3/2} > 0.4502.$$

Applying Lemma 1 with $\varkappa = 0.5$ and $\gamma = 0.4502$ (which leads to $K = 4$), we conclude that there exists $z_0 \in [1, P]$ with

$$\frac{|\widehat{A}(z_0)|^2}{\alpha(1-\alpha)p^2/2} > 0.2131$$

and accordingly

$$|\widehat{A}(z_0)| > \sqrt{0.2131 \alpha(1-\alpha)/2} p > 0.152p.$$

□

Dilating A , if necessary, we assume that, in fact,

$$|\widehat{A}(1)| > 0.152p. \quad (6)$$

Choose an integer u_0 such that the number of elements of A in $[u_0, u_0 + p/2)_p$ is maximized, set $A_0 := A \cap [u_0, u_0 + p/2)_p$ and $m := |A_0|$, and let $B_0 := \varphi_p^{-1}(A_0) \cap [u_0, u_0 + p/2)$. Furthermore, put $\ell := \max B_0 - \min B_0$; thus A_0 is contained in a block of $\ell + 1$ consecutive elements of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ and

$$m = \max\{|A \cap [u, u + p/2)_p| : u \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

We notice that the last equality implies that

$$n - m \leq |A \cap [u, u + p/2)_p| \leq m \quad (7)$$

for all real u .

By Lemma 2 we have

$$m \geq \frac{n}{2} + \frac{p}{2\pi} \arcsin\left(|\widehat{A}(1)| \sin \frac{\pi}{p}\right) > \left(0.159 + \frac{1}{2\pi} \arcsin(0.1519\pi)\right)p > 0.238p. \quad (8)$$

Since B_0 is a subset of an interval of length $\ell < p/2$, this shows that B_0 is not contained in an arithmetic progression with difference greater than 2, and we now dispose of the case where B_0 is contained in an arithmetic progression with difference 2.

Claim 2. *If B_0 is contained in an arithmetic progression with difference 2, then the conclusion of the theorem holds true.*

Proof. If B_0 is contained in an arithmetic progression with difference 2, then there is an integer u and a set $C \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ such that $C \subseteq [u, u + p/4)_p$ and either $A_0 = 2 * C$, or $A_0 = 2 * C + 1$. Evidently, we have $\lfloor p/4 \rfloor < \frac{3}{2}m - 1$, whence $(-m, m)_p \subseteq C - C$ by Lemma 5 (see also the remark after the lemma), implying $2 * (-m, m)_p \subseteq A_0 - A_0$. Since A is sum-free, we derive that the set $2 * (-m, m)_p$ is disjoint with A , and replacing A with its dilation by the factor $(p-1)/2$ we obtain $A \subseteq [m, p-m]_p$. The assertion now follows from Lemma 7, as

$$(p - n + 1)/3 < 0.228p < m$$

by (8). □

In what follows we assume that B_0 is *not* contained in an arithmetic progression with difference greater than 1.

Since the sets A and $A - A$ are disjoint, we have

$$n \leq p - |A - A| \leq p - |A_0 - A_0|.$$

To estimate $|A_0 - A_0|$ we apply Lemma 3; this gives

$$p - n \geq |A_0 - A_0| \geq \min\{\ell + m, 3m - 3\}. \quad (9)$$

Assuming that $\ell \geq 2m - 3$ and using (8) we then obtain

$$p \geq n + 3m - 3 > (0.318 + 3 \cdot 0.238)p - 3 = 1.032p - 3,$$

a contradiction. Thus

$$\ell \leq 2m - 4, \quad (10)$$

$$|A_0 - A_0| \geq \ell + m, \quad (11)$$

and $p - n \geq \ell + m$ by (9), whence

$$\ell \leq p - n - m. \quad (12)$$

We assume, furthermore, that

$$\ell \geq \frac{3}{2}m - 1; \quad (13)$$

for otherwise $(-m, m)_p \cap A = \emptyset$ by Lemma 5, and consequently $A \subseteq [n, p - n]_p$ (as at the end of the proof of Claim 2). Assumption (13) will eventually lead us to a contradiction.

Claim 3. *We have*

$$A \cap (-m/2, m/2)_p = \emptyset.$$

Proof. Let μ be defined by (4); we want to show that $\mu \geq m/2$. Notice, that by (10) and Lemma 4 we have $((\ell - m + 1)/2, m/2)_p \subseteq A_0 - A_0 \subseteq A - A$, and consequently $((\ell - m + 1)/2, m/2)_p \cap A = \emptyset$; thus, it actually suffices to prove that $\mu > (\ell - m)/2$. Assume that this is wrong, and hence

$$\cos \pi \frac{\mu}{p} \geq \cos \pi \frac{\ell - m}{2p} \geq \cos \pi \frac{p - n - 2m}{2p} = \sin \pi \frac{n + 2m}{2p} \quad (14)$$

holds by (12).

Since $A \cap (A + \mu) = \emptyset$, we have $|A \cup (A + \mu)| = 2n$ and

$$\left| \sum_{a \in A \cup (\mu + A)} e_p(a) \right| = |(1 + e_p(\mu)) \hat{A}(1)| = 2|\hat{A}(1)| \cos \pi \frac{\mu}{p}. \quad (15)$$

We distinguish two cases. Assume first that $m > 0.25p$. From (15) we get

$$2|\hat{A}(1)| \cos \pi \frac{\mu}{p} \leq \left| \sum_{z=0}^{2n-1} e_p(z) \right| = \frac{\sin 2\pi n/p}{\sin \pi/p}$$

which, along with (14), (6), and the assumption $m > 0.25p$, implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sin 2\pi \frac{n}{p} &\geq 2|\hat{A}(1)| \cos \pi \frac{\mu}{p} \sin \frac{\pi}{p} \\ &> 0.954 \frac{|\hat{A}(1)|}{0.152p} \cdot \frac{\sin \pi/p}{3.141/p} \cdot \cos \pi \frac{\mu}{p} \\ &> 0.954 \sin \pi \frac{n + 2m}{2p} \\ &> 0.954 \sin \frac{\pi}{2} \left(\frac{n}{p} + 0.5 \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify, however, that the function

$$\sin 2\pi x - 0.954 \sin \frac{\pi}{2} (x + 0.5)$$

is negative for any $x \in (0.318, 0.334)$, a contradiction.

Assume now that $m < 0.25p$. In this case we apply Lemma 2 to the set $A \cup (A + \mu)$, observing that by (7) any interval of the form $[u, u + p/2)_p$ with integer u contains at most $2m$ elements of this set; in view of (15) this yields

$$2m \geq n + \frac{p}{2\pi} \arcsin \left(2|\widehat{A}(1)| \cos \pi \frac{\mu}{p} \sin \frac{\pi}{p} \right)$$

and hence

$$2\pi \frac{2m - n}{p} \geq \arcsin \left(2|\widehat{A}(1)| \cos \pi \frac{\mu}{p} \sin \frac{\pi}{p} \right).$$

Since $2\pi(2m - n)/p \leq 2\pi m/p < \pi/2$ we obtain

$$\sin 2\pi \frac{2m - n}{p} \geq 2|\widehat{A}(1)| \cos \pi \frac{\mu}{p} \sin \frac{\pi}{p}$$

which, as above, yields

$$\sin 2\pi \frac{2m - n}{p} > 0.954 \cos \pi \frac{\mu}{p} > 0.954 \sin \pi \frac{n + 2m}{2p}. \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, it is not difficult to see that the function

$$\sin 2\pi(2y - x) - 0.954 \sin \frac{\pi}{2} (x + 2y)$$

is negative in the region $x \in (0.318, 0.334)$, $y \in (0.23, 0.25)$, a contradiction again. $\square$

Set

$$\begin{aligned} A_1^+ &:= A \cap [m/2, \ell - m + 1]_p, & A_2^+ &:= A \cap [m, p/4)_p, \\ A_1^- &:= A \cap [-(\ell - m + 1), -m/2]_p, & A_2^- &:= A \cap (-p/4, -m]_p, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$A_1 := A_1^+ \cup A_1^-, \quad A_2 := A_2^+ \cup A_2^-,$$

so that

$$A \cap [0, p/4)_p = A_1^+ \cup A_2^+ \quad \text{and} \quad A \cap (-p/4, 0]_p = A_1^- \cup A_2^- \quad (17)$$

by Lemma 4 (applied with $k = 1$) and Claim 3; observe also that $m/2 \leq \ell - m + 1$ by (13), and that $A_2 = \emptyset$ if $m > 0.25p$. For definiteness, we assume for the rest of the proof that

$$|A_1^+| \geq |A_1^-| \quad (18)$$

and hence $A_1^+ \neq \emptyset$: otherwise by (7) we would have

$$n - m \leq |A_2| \leq \max\{0, p/2 - 2m\},$$

leading to either $m = n$ (in which case we are done by Lemma 7), or $n + m < p/2$ (which contradicts (8)).

Given two subsets S_1 and S_2 of an additively written semigroup, we write

$$S_1 + S_2 := \{s_1 + s_2 : s_1 \in S_1, s_2 \in S_2\}.$$

It is well-known and easy to prove that if S_1 and S_2 are finite non-empty sets of integers, then $|S_1 + S_2| \geq |S_1| + |S_2| - 1$ holds. Clearly, this inequality remains valid also if S_1 and S_2 are non-empty subsets of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, contained in two intervals of total length, smaller than p .

Our next claim refines the estimate (12).

Claim 4. *We have*

$$\ell \leq p - n - m - 2|A_2| + 2.$$

Proof. The assertion follows from the fact that the sets A and

$$A_2^+ + A_2^+ \subseteq [2m, p/2)_p, \quad A_2^- + A_2^- \subseteq (p/2, p - 2m]_p, \quad A_0 - A_0 \subseteq [-\ell, \ell]$$

are pairwise disjoint, the estimate (11), and the observation that $|A_2^+ + A_2^+| \geq 2|A_2^+| - 1$ and $|A_2^- + A_2^-| \geq 2|A_2^-| - 1$. $\square$

Write $I := [-(2m - \ell - 2), 2m - \ell - 2]_p$ and $J := 2 * A_1^+ + I$. We observe that

$$J \cap A = (-J) \cap A = \emptyset \tag{19}$$

by Lemma 6 (which is applicable since $A_1^+ \subseteq [m/2, \ell - m + 1]_p \subseteq [\ell/4, \ell/2]_p$, as it follows from (10)). Let $k := |A_1^+|$, write $A_1^+ = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$, where the elements are so numbered that their inverse images in $[m/2, \ell - m + 1]$ under φ_p form an increasing sequence, and for $i \in [1, k]$ set $S_i := 2 * \{a_1, \dots, a_i\} + I$. We have then $S_1 = |I| = 4m - 2\ell - 3$ and $|S_{i+1} \setminus S_i| \geq 2$ for $i \in [1, k - 1]$, and it follows that

$$|J| = |S_k| \geq (4m - 2\ell - 3) + 2(k - 1) = 2|A_1^+| + 4m - 2\ell - 5. \tag{20}$$

We are now in a position to complete the proof showing that the above-made assumptions (see the remark following (13)) lead to a contradiction. We consider separately two cases: $m < 0.244p$ and $m > 0.244p$.

Case I: $m < 0.244p$. We revisit the proof of Claim 3, defining μ by (4) and observing that (16) gives

$$\mu > \frac{1}{\pi} \arccos \left(1.049 \sin 2\pi \left(\frac{2m}{p} - 0.318 \right) \right) p. \tag{21}$$

(This estimate is stronger, than $\mu \geq m/2$, for small values of m , and in particular for $m < 0.244p$.)

Since $A_1^+ \subseteq [\mu, \ell - m + 1]_p$, we have

$$J \subseteq [\ell - 2m + 2\mu + 2, \ell]_p,$$

hence (18), (19) and (20) yield

$$|[\ell - 2m + 2\mu + 2, \ell]_p \setminus A| \geq 2|A_1^+| + 4m - 2\ell - 5$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |[-\ell, -(\ell - 2m + 2\mu + 2)]_p \setminus A| &\geq 2|A_1^+| + 4m - 2\ell - 5 \\ &\geq 2|A_1^-| + 4m - 2\ell - 5. \end{aligned}$$

Adding up these estimates we obtain

$$|[\ell - 2m + 2\mu + 2, p - (\ell - 2m + 2\mu + 2)]_p \setminus A| \geq 2|A_1| + 8m - 4\ell - 10,$$

and it follows that

$$|[\ell - 2m + 2\mu + 2, p - (\ell - 2m + 2\mu + 2)]_p \cap A| \leq p - 2|A_1| + 2\ell - 4m - 4\mu + 7. \quad (22)$$

We notice now that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell - 2m + 2\mu + 1 &\leq \ell - m + 1 \leq p - n - 2m + 1 \\ &< (1 - 0.318 - 2 \cdot 0.238)p + 1 < 0.25p \end{aligned}$$

by (12) and (8), and consequently

$$|[-(\ell - 2m + 2\mu + 1), \ell - 2m + 2\mu + 1]_p \cap A| \leq |A_1| + |A_2|$$

holds. Taking the sum of the last inequality and (22), observing that $|A_1| + |A_2| \geq n - m$ by (7), and using the estimate of Claim 4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} n &\leq p - |A_1| + |A_2| + 2\ell - 4m - 4\mu + 7 \\ &\leq 3p - |A_1| - |A_2| - 2n - 6m - 4\mu + 11 \\ &\leq 3p - 3n - 5m - 4\mu + 11. \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\frac{4\mu}{p} \leq 3 - \frac{4n}{p} - \frac{5m}{p} + \frac{11}{p} < 1.729 - \frac{5m}{p},$$

and comparing this with (21) we obtain

$$\frac{4}{\pi} \arccos \left(1.049 \sin 2\pi \left(\frac{2m}{p} - 0.318 \right) \right) < 1.729 - \frac{5m}{p}.$$

However, a routine investigation shows that

$$\frac{4}{\pi} \arccos (1.049 \sin 2\pi(2x - 0.318)) - 1.729 + 5x$$

is positive for $x \in (0.238, 0.244)$.

Case II: $m > 0.244p$. Recalling (18) we get

$$|A_1^+| \geq \frac{1}{2} |A_1| = \frac{1}{2} (|(-p/4, p/4)_p \cap A| - |A_2|) \geq \frac{1}{2} (n - m - |A_2|) \quad (23)$$

by (7) and the definitions of A_1 and A_2 . We also observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |A_1^+| &\leq (\ell - m + 1) - m/2 + 1 \\ &\leq p - n - \frac{5}{2}m + 2 \\ &= (n - m) - \left(2n + \frac{3}{2}m - p\right) + 2 \\ &< (n - m) - (2 \cdot 0.318 + 1.5 \cdot 0.244 - 1)p + 2 \\ &< n - m \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

by (12).

Using Claim 4 we derive from (23) that

$$\begin{aligned} |[m/2, \ell - m + 1]_p \setminus A_1^+| &\leq \left(\ell - \frac{3}{2}m + 2\right) - \frac{1}{2}(n - m - |A_2|) \\ &= \ell - m - \frac{1}{2}n + \frac{1}{2}|A_2| + 2 \\ &= 2(2m - \ell - 2) + 3\ell - 5m - \frac{1}{2}n + \frac{1}{2}|A_2| + 6 \\ &\leq 2(2m - \ell - 2) + 3p - 8m - \frac{7}{2}n + 12 \\ &< 2(2m - \ell - 2) - (8 \cdot 0.238 + 3.5 \cdot 0.318 - 3)p + 12 \\ &< 2(2m - \ell - 2), \end{aligned}$$

and it follows that the set J is an interval in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. Consequently, by (7), Claim 3, the definition of A_1^+ , (17), and (19) we have

$$\begin{aligned} n - m &\leq |(-m/2, (p - m)/2)_p \cap A| \\ &= |A_1^+| + |[m, (p - m)/2)_p \cap A| \\ &\leq |A_1^+| + |[m, (p - m)/2)_p \setminus J|. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Since $J \subseteq [\ell - m + 2, \ell]_p$ (as it is immediate from the definitions of J and A_1^+), we have

$$|[m, (p - m)/2)_p \setminus J| \leq \max\{|[m, (p - m)/2)_p \setminus J_1|, |[m, (p - m)/2)_p \setminus J_2|\},$$

where

$$J_1 := [\ell - m + 2, \ell - m + |J| + 1]_p \quad \text{and} \quad J_2 := [\ell + 1 - |J|, \ell]_p$$

(so that J_1 and J_2 are subintervals of the interval $[\ell - m + 2, \ell]_p$ with $|J_1| = |J_2| = |J|$, adjacent to the endpoints of this interval). Accordingly, from (25) we deduce that

$$|[m, (p - m)/2)_p \setminus J_i| \geq n - m - |A_1^+| \quad (26)$$

holds true with either $i = 1$, or $i = 2$.

By (24), assuming that (26) holds with $i = 1$ we obtain

$$n - m - |A_1^+| < (p - m)/2 - (\ell - m + |J| + 1) + 1.$$

Using (20), (23), and Claim 4 we now get

$$\begin{aligned} |A_1^+| + 4m - 2\ell - 5 &\leq |J| - |A_1^+| < 0.5p + \frac{3}{2}m - n - \ell, \\ |A_1^+| < 0.5p - \frac{5}{2}m - n + \ell + 5 &\leq 1.5p - \frac{7}{2}m - 2n - 2|A_2| + 7, \\ \frac{5}{2}n + 3m &< 1.5p + 7, \end{aligned}$$

which is wrong since

$$\frac{5}{2}n + 3m > (2.5 \cdot 0.318 + 3 \cdot 0.238)p = 1.509p.$$

Assume now that (26) holds with $i = 2$. Since

$$\frac{1}{2}(n - m - |A_2|) \leq |A_1^+| \leq \ell - \frac{3}{2}m + 2$$

by (23) and the definition of A_1^+ , we have

$$\ell \geq \frac{1}{2}n + m - \frac{1}{2}|A_2| - 2 = \frac{1}{2}(p - m) + \frac{1}{2}(n + 3m - p - |A_2|) - 2 > \frac{1}{2}(p - m),$$

as $|A_2| \leq \max\{0, 0.5p - 2m + 2\}$ and

$$n + 3m > (0.318 + 3 \cdot 0.238)p = 1.032p,$$

$$n + 5m > (0.318 + 5 \cdot 0.238)p = 1.508p.$$

Similarly to the above we now obtain from (26) and (24)

$$n - m - |A_1^+| \leq (\ell + 1 - |J|) - m + 1$$

and using (20), (23), and Claim 4 derive that

$$\begin{aligned} |A_1^+| + 4m - 2\ell - 5 &\leq |J| - |A_1^+| \leq \ell - n + 2, \\ |A_1^+| &\leq 3\ell - 4m - n + 7 \leq 3p - 7m - 4n - 6|A_2| + 13, \\ 3p + 13 &\geq \frac{9}{2}n + \frac{13}{2}m > (4.5 \cdot 0.318 + 6.5 \cdot 0.244)p = 3.017p, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction, as wanted.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are grateful to Dr. K. Srinivas for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [DF06] J.-M. DESHOUILLEERS and G. A. FREIMAN, On sum-free sets modulo p , *Functiones et Approximatio* **XXXV** (2006), 7–15.
- [F62] G. A. FREIMAN, Inverse problems in additive number theory, VI. On the addition of finite sets, III. *Izv. Vyss. Uchebn. Zaved. Matematika* **3** (28) (1962), 151–157 (in Russian).
- [L06a] V.F. LEV, Distribution of points on arcs, *Integers* **5** (2) (2005), A11, 6 pp. (electronic).
- [L06b] ———, Large sum-free sets in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, *Israel Journal of Math.* **154** (2006), 221–234.
- [L] ———, On sum-free subsets of the torus group, *Functiones et Approximatio*, to appear.
- [LS95] V.F. LEV and P.Y. SMELIANSKY, On addition of two distinct sets of integers, *Acta Arithmetica* **70** (1) (1995), 85–91.

E-mail address: jean-marc.deshouillers@math.u-bordeaux1.fr

BORDEAUX UNIVERSITY & CNRS, IMB UMR 5251, 33405 TALENCE, FRANCE.

E-mail address: seva@math.haifa.ac.il

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF HAIFA AT ORANIM, TIVON 36006, ISRAEL.